



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/726,779      | 12/03/2003  | Rudy A. Vandebelt    | HW-129              | 6135             |

37275 7590 09/29/2004  
LAW OFFICE OF A.P. DURIGON  
20 EUSTIS STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02140

EXAMINER

CINTINS, IVARS C

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1724

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/726,779

**Applicant(s)**

VANDENBELT ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ivars C. Cintins

**Art Unit**

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

Art Unit: 1724

Claims 8 and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, because these claims appear to recite limitations which are already present in parent claim 6. Applicant is advised that an amendment changing the dependency of claim 8 from claim 6 to claim 7 would overcome this objection.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The term "adapted to" as recited in claim 1 (lines 7, 8, 11 and 13), claim 7 (line 11) and claim 13 (lines 6, 7, 10 and 12) is vague, and indefinite as to the structural limitations intended. Applicant is advised that an amendment positively reciting means or structural elements for performing all of the recited functions would overcome this rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahana (U.S. Patent No. 5,637,214) in view of Hollander (U.S. Patent No. 6,193,894). Kahana discloses a portable, refillable water dispenser having a module for processing moving water, which module is capable of removing both inorganic and organic contaminants from the water (see col. 3, lines 45-48). Accordingly, this primary reference discloses the claimed invention

Art Unit: 1724

with the exception of the recited UV module. Hollander teaches placing a self-contained, battery powered UV module in a pitcher of drinking water (see col. 8, lines 61-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the filtered water container of Kahana (i.e. element 22) with the UV module of Hollander, in order to further purify (i.e. sterilize) the treated water in this primary reference device.

Claims 4 and 5 would be allowed if amended to overcome the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and if further rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because the references of record do not teach or fairly suggest a water purifier of the type recited having a control panel and user interface located on the handle. Claim 6 would be allowed if amended to overcome the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and if further rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because the references of record do not teach or fairly suggest a water purifier of the type recited having a louvered disc valve that permits water to be received through the fill opening while blocking direct viewing of UV radiation within the pitcher. Claims 7 and 10-12 would be allowed if amended to overcome the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the references of record do not teach or fairly suggest a water purifier of the type recited having a controller, a control panel and a user interface carried by the pitcher. Claims 8 and 9 would also be allowed if amended to overcome the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and objection under 37 CFR 1.75(c) in the manner suggested.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (571) 272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If

Art Unit: 1724

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**Ivars C. Cintins**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1724**

I. Cintins  
September 26, 2004